

## EXHIBIT C

**CONFIDENTIAL PURSUANT TO RULE 26(C) PROTECTIVE ORDER**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

In re

CUSTOMS AND TAX ADMINISTRATION OF THE  
KINGDOM OF DENMARK  
(SKATTEFORVALTNINGEN) TAX REFUND SCHEME  
LITIGATION

**GRAHAM WADE**  
**EXHIBIT 5001**  
03 - 16 - 2022

MASTER DOCKET

18-md-2865 (LAK)

**EXPERT REPORT OF GRAHAM WADE**

December 31, 2021

c) **It Is Not the Market Standard to Engage in Equally Offsetting Futures in Equity Finance Transactions Where the Costs of Commissions, Fees, and the Bid-Ask Spread Were Ignored by Solo and Which are the Equivalent of Wash Trades**

258. In my experience, in transactions where futures are used as hedging instruments in equity finance transactions, it is not market standard for the gains and losses on the component elements of a trade to net perfectly to zero. Netting to zero, in this instance, refers to a zero gain or loss for Delvian after combining the equity purchase, future sale, equity sale, future purchase, net dividend, stock loan interest, and fees. This outcome is uncommon because of additional costs, such as trading commissions, exchange clearing fees, financing spreads (typically parties in the transaction want to earn some spread), sourcing cost (the shares in the transaction have to come from somewhere; the party with the shares expects compensation for the expected real dividend and this cost is built into the share price and future), as well as other possible supply and demand factors which need to be priced.

**7. It is not the Market Standard for Parties to a Stock Loan or Broker-Custodians to Retroactively Alter the Terms of the Original Stock Loan So That the Trades Net to Zero**

259. In my experience, it is not market standard for the custodian's employees to manually adjust the stock loan fees and interest to make the trade (excluding the tax reclaim) net out perfectly to zero for trades that would otherwise leave the reclaim applicant with a loss or gain if the actual terms of the trade were applied. The reason this occurrence seems unlikely is that an independent arm's-length transaction involves retrospective renegotiation of a contract. If it did, one party would necessarily lose out financially, causing the transaction to lose its appeal and making it less likely that any party that was assured of loss would agree to participate in such a transaction.

260. Here, Solo, Delvian, and Aquila did precisely this: they retroactively adjusted interest and fees on the original stock loan agreement such that Delvian's trades netted out to zero, so that there was zero trading loss or gain on the plan's transactions. This left the dividend withholding tax refund paid by SKAT as the only gain.